



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/742,309	12/18/2003	Masaki Kashiwagi	CFA00027US	5665

34904 7590 03/29/2010  
CANON U.S.A. INC. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DIVISION  
15975 ALTON PARKWAY  
IRVINE, CA 92618-3731

EXAMINER
----------

SINGH, SATWANT K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2625

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

03/29/2010

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

sivon.kalminov@cda.canon.com  
marlene.klein@cda.canon.com  
IPDocketing@cda.canon.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/742,309	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KASHIWAGI, MASAKI	
	<b>Examiner</b> SATWANT K. SINGH	<b>Art Unit</b> 2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 January 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)         | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 26 January 2010 has been entered.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 11 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 9-15, 17, 18, 20-25, 27, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyamoto et al. (US 7,119,931) in view of Ichiriki (US 6,040,920).

5. Regarding Claim 1, Miyamoto et al teaches an image processing apparatus comprising: a reading unit configured to read a document (Fig. 2, scanner 14) (scanner functions as an image reading device) (col. 8, lines 14-19)

Art Unit: 2625

fed from an automatic document feeder (ADF 23) (col. 8, lines 36-44); a reading control unit configured to perform a successive reading operation (reading successive sheets of the original read by said reading part) (claim 1), wherein, in the successive reading operation, plural sets of document sheets are independently fed from the automatic document feeder (sheets of the original set are separately fed through the ADF) and read by the reading unit (scanner reads the image data) (col. 8, lines 36-45) until a read-end command is input (Fig. 3, S4-S11) (recognizing that the document has ended) (col. 9, line 58-col. 10 line 2); an image outputting unit configured to collectively output the image data corresponding to the plural sets of document sheets stored in the image storage unit (Fig. 3, S11) (image data transferred to the server apparatus) (col. 9, line 58-col. 10 line 2); and a control unit configured to enable the display unit to display an image corresponding to the read image data (displays of the reading operation picture) (col. 14, lines 59-64).

Miyamoto et al fails to teach an apparatus comprising: an image storage unit configured to store image data corresponding to the document sheet read by the reading unit; a display unit configured to display an image corresponding to the image data stored in the image storage unit; image data corresponding to the read plural sets of document sheets is stored in the image storage unit as image data corresponding to a series of document sheets; and a control unit configured to enable the display unit to display an image corresponding to the read image data in each period after performing each reading operation of plural sets of documents sheets and before inputting the read-end command.

Ichiriki teaches an apparatus comprising: an image storage unit configured to store image data corresponding to the document sheet read by the reading unit (Fig. 1, document storage apparatus 2) (a document storage section 2b for storing electronic documents each of which has been created by the document creating apparatus and in each of which at least one group of image data is stored in page units) (col. 4, lines 32-57); image data corresponding to the read plural sets of document sheets is stored in the image storage unit as image data corresponding to a series of document sheets (plurality of pages is stored in the document storage apparatus in such a manner that the document is stored in the form of an electronic document in which at least one set of image data is stored in page units) (col. 14, line 59 - col. 15, line 3); and a control unit configured to enable the display unit to display an image corresponding to the read image data in each period after performing each reading operation of plural sets of documents sheets (image data can be transmitted/received in page units and therefore the response time required to complete the operation for demanding display of the page can be shortened) (col. 15, lines 3-12) and before inputting the read-end command (it is determined whether or not the document reading operation has been ended) (col. 7, line 62-col. 8, line 3).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Miyamoto with the teaching of Ichiriki to allow for the transmission/reception of image data in page units in order to reduce the response time required to complete the operation of demanding display of the page

Art Unit: 2625

Miyamoto et al and Ichiriki fail to teach an apparatus comprising: a display unit configured to display an image corresponding to the image data stored in the image storage unit.

Mori teaches an apparatus comprising: a display unit configured to display an image corresponding to the image data stored in the image storage unit (Fig. 1, display section 10B) (displays image data on the screen) (col. 5, lines 64-65).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Miyamoto and Ichiriki with the teaching of Mori to allow a user to view a scanned document directly on the MFP.

6. Regarding Claim 2, Miyamoto et al teaches an image processing apparatus, wherein the control unit enables the display unit to display the image at a period between a first reading operation for one set of the plural sets of document sheets and a second reading operation for another set of the plural sets of document sheets, the second reading operation being performed after the first reading operation (method of indicating the separation of documents) (col. 14, lines 38-64).

7. Regarding Claim 3, Miyamoto et al teaches an image processing apparatus, further comprising: a command acceptance unit configured to accept the read-end command in the successive reading operation (Fig. 3, S4-S11) (recognizing that the document has ended) (col. 9, line 58-col. 10 line 2), wherein, in the successive reading operation, the control unit enables the display unit to display the image data the command acceptance unit accepts the read-

Art Unit: 2625

end command (controlling an interval of transmission of image data) (col. 14, lines 38-64).

8. Regarding Claim 4, Miyamoto et al teaches an image processing apparatus, wherein, in the successive reading operation, the control unit enables the display unit to display the image before the second reading operation is started (controlling an interval of transmission of image data) (col. 14, lines 38-64).

9. Regarding Claim 5, Miyamoto et al teaches an image processing apparatus, wherein, in the successive reading operation, the control unit enables the display unit to display the image after completion of the first reading operation and before the second reading operation is started (controlling an interval of transmission of image data) (col. 14, lines 38-64).

10. Regarding Claim 7, Miyamoto et al teaches an image processing apparatus, wherein in response to completion of the first reading operation, inputting of a command to display the image corresponding to the image data stored in the image storage unit on the display unit is enabled (thumbnail image of document is displayed on the display device) (col. 9, lines 35-39).

11. Regarding Claim 8, Miyamoto et al teaches an image processing apparatus, wherein in response to completion of the first reading operation, inputting of the read-end command in the successive reading operation is enabled (Fig. 3, S6, set time out) (col. 9, lines 62-63).

12. Regarding Claim 10, Miyamoto et al teaches an image processing apparatus, further comprising: a suspending instruction unit configured to instruct

Art Unit: 2625

suspension of the successive reading operation for the series of document sheets and resume the suspended reading operation, wherein the period is provided by the suspending instruction unit (Fig. 3, S17, cancelling Key pressed) (col. 10, lines 38-41).

13. Regarding Claim 11 and 21, Miyamoto et al teaches an image processing method comprising: performing a successive reading operation (reading successive sheets of the original read by said reading part) (claim 1), wherein, in the successive reading operation, plural sets of document sheets are independently fed from an automatic document feeder (sheets of the original set are separately fed through the ADF) and read (scanner reads the image data) (col. 8, lines 36-45) until a read end command is input (Fig. 3, S4-S11) (recognizing that the document has ended) (col. 9, line 58-col. 10 line 2), and outputting, collectively, the image data corresponding to the plural sets of document sheets stored in the image storage unit (Fig. 3, S11) (image data transferred to the server apparatus) (col. 9, line 58-col. 10 line 2); and allowing a display unit to display the stored image (displays of the reading operation picture) (col. 14, lines 59-64) corresponding to the read image data (image data in units of documents is displayed on the display device successively) (col. 14, lines 20-23).

Miyamoto et al fails to teach a method comprising: image data corresponding to the read plural sets of document sheets is stored in an image storage unit as image data corresponding to a series of document sheets; and a display unit to display the stored image corresponding to the read image in each



Art Unit: 2625

period after performing each reading operation of plural sets of document sheets and before inputting the read-end command.

Ichiriki teaches a method comprising: image data corresponding to the read plural sets of document sheets is stored in an image storage unit as image data corresponding to a series of document sheets (plurality of pages is stored in the document storage apparatus in such a manner that the document is stored in the form of an electronic document in which at least one set of image data is stored in page units) (col. 14, line 59 - col. 15, line 3); and display the stored image corresponding to the read image in each period after performing each reading operation of plural sets of document sheets (image data can be transmitted/received in page units and therefore the response time required to complete the operation for demanding display of the page can be shortened) (col. 15, lines 3-12) and before inputting the read-end command (it is determined whether or not the document reading operation has been ended) (col. 7, line 62 - col. 8, line 3).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Miyamoto with the teaching of Ichiriki to allow for the transmission/reception of image data in page units in order to reduce the response time required to complete the operation of demanding display of the page

Miyamoto et al and Ichiriki fail to teach a method comprising: a display unit to display the stored image.

Art Unit: 2625

Mori teaches an apparatus comprising: a display unit to display the stored image (Fig. 1, display section 10B) (displays image data on the screen) (col. 5, lines 64-65).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Miyamoto and Ichiriki with the teaching of Mori to allow a user to view a scanned document directly on the MFP.

14. Regarding Claims 12 and 22, Miyamoto et al teaches an image processing method, wherein displaying of the image by the display unit is allowed a period between a first reading operation for one set of the plural sets of document sheets and a second reading operation for another set of the plural sets of document sheets, the second reading operation being performed after the first reading operation (method of indicating the separation of documents) (col. 14, lines 38-64).

15. Regarding Claims 13 and 23, Miyamoto et al teaches an image processing method, further comprising: accepting the read-end command in the successive reading operation (Fig. 3, S4-S11) (recognizing that the document has ended) (col. 9, line 58-col. 10 line 2), wherein, in the successive reading operation, displaying of the image by the display unit is allowed before the read-end command is accepted (controlling an interval of transmission of image data) (col. 14, lines 38-64).

16. Regarding Claims 14 and 24, Miyamoto et al teaches an image processing method, wherein, in the successive reading operation, displaying of

Art Unit: 2625

the image by the display unit is allowed before the second reading operation is started (controlling an interval of transmission of image data) (col. 14, lines 38-64).

17. Regarding Claims 15 and 25, Miyamoto et al teaches an image processing method, wherein, in the successive reading operation, displaying of the image by the display unit is allowed after completion of the first reading operation and before the second reading operation is started (controlling an interval of transmission of image data) (col. 14, lines 38-64).

18. Regarding Claims 17 and 27, Miyamoto et al teaches an image processing method, wherein in response to completion of the first reading operation, inputting of a command to display the image corresponding to image data stored in the image storage unit on the display unit is enabled (thumbnail image of document is displayed on the display device) (col. 9, lines 35-39).

19. Regarding Claims 18 and 28, Miyamoto et al teaches an image processing method, wherein in response to completion of the first reading operation, inputting of the read-end command in the successive reading operation is enabled (Fig. 3, S6, set time out) (col. 9, lines 62-63).

20. Regarding Claims 20 and 30, Miyamoto et al teaches an image processing method, further comprising instructing suspension of the successive reading operation for the series of document sheets; and resuming the suspended reading operation, wherein the period is provided by the instruction (Fig. 3, S17, cancelling Key pressed) (col. 10, lines 38-41).

Art Unit: 2625

21. Claims 6, 9, 16, 19, 26, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyamoto et al, Ichiriki, and Mori as applied to claims 1 and 11 above, and further in view of Kanda (US 7,212,307).

22. Regarding Claim 6, Miyamoto et al, Ichiriki, and Mori fail to teach an image processing apparatus, further comprising: a re-read unit configured to re-read a document by the image reading unit and replace data corresponding to an image currently displayed on the display unit with image data obtained by the re-reading.

Kanda teaches an image processing apparatus, further comprising: a re-read unit configured to re-read a document by the reading unit and replace image data corresponding to an image currently displayed on the display unit with image data obtained by the re-reading (image data for each page are read out by means of the memory/HDD control section for a set number of times) (col. 6, lines 17-29).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Miyamoto, Ichiriki and Mori with the teaching of Kanda to re-read the image data to prevent errors in the output image and make sure the correct image is being output.

23. Regarding Claim 9, Miyamoto et al, Ichiriki, and Mori fail to teach an image processing apparatus, wherein a re-read command is allowed to be input to re-read a document by the reading unit and replace image data corresponding to the image currently displayed on the display unit with image data obtained by the re-reading.

Kanda teaches an image processing apparatus, wherein a re-read command is allowed to be input to re-read a document by the reading unit and replace image data corresponding to the image currently displayed on the display unit with image data obtained by the re-reading (image data for each page are read out by means of the memory/HDD control section for a set number of times) (col. 6, lines 17-29).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Miyamoto, Ichiriki and Mori with the teaching of Kanda to re-read the image data to prevent errors in the output image and make sure the correct image is being output.

24. Regarding Claim 16 and 26, Miyamoto et al, Ichiriki, and Mori fail to teach an image processing method, further comprising- re-reading a document; and replacing image data corresponding to an image currently displayed on the display unit with image data obtained by the re-reading.

Kanda teaches an image processing apparatus, further comprising- re-reading a document; and replacing image data corresponding to an image currently displayed on the display unit with image data obtained by the re-reading (image data for each page are read out by means of the memory/HDD control section for a set number of times) (col. 6, lines 17-29).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Miyamoto, Ichiriki and Mori with the teaching of Kanda to re-read the image data to prevent errors in the output image and make sure the correct image is being output.

Art Unit: 2625

25. Regarding Claim 19 and 29, Miyamoto et al, Ichiriki, and Mori fail to teach an image processing apparatus, wherein a re-read command is allowed to be input to re-read a document and replace image data corresponding to image data corresponding to the image currently displayed on the display unit with image data obtained by the re-reading.

Kanda teaches an image processing apparatus, wherein a re-read command is allowed to be input to re-read a document and replace image data corresponding to image data corresponding to the image currently displayed on the display unit with image data obtained by the re-reading (image data for each page are read out by means of the memory/HDD control section for a set number of times) (col. 6, lines 17-29).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Miyamoto, Ichiriki and Mori with the teaching of Kanda to re-read the image data to prevent errors in the output image and make sure the correct image is being output.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SATWANT K. SINGH whose telephone number is (571)272-7468. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward L. Coles can be reached on (571) 272-7402. The

Art Unit: 2625

fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Satwant K. Singh/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2625

sks